



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,196	11/14/2001	Jose Fernandez	42390P10728	5794
8791	7590	05/04/2005	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			GUILL, RUSSELL L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2123	

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/004,196	FERNANDEZ, JOSE	
	Examiner Russell L. Guill	Art Unit 2123	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 - 49 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 November 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 49 have been examined. Claims 1 – 49 have been rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims appear to be directed to an abstract idea that does not result in a concrete, useful and tangible result.
4. Claims 9 – 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although the claims recite an apparatus, the claims appear to be directed to an abstract idea that does not produce a tangible result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the

effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1 – 3, 6 – 13, 15 – 20, 22 – 23, 43 – 44, and 47 – 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Manning (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number US 2002/0103829).

6.1. Regarding claim 1, Manning appears to teach receiving a persistence package (figure 3, item 100 – 102; please note that a DTD is a Document Type Definition that provides attributes for each element in the document, and indicates the relationship of the elements – please refer to paragraph [0004]; and paragraph [0028]).

6.2. Regarding claim 1, Manning appears to teach deriving persistent data having a model structure from the persistence package (figure 3, items 114 – 128; and paragraph [0029]).

6.3. Regarding claim 1, Manning appears to teach using metadata passed from the persistence package to establish at least one of a storage format and a storage location for the persistent data during a runtime of the receiving system (figure 3, items 100 – 110; and paragraph [0028]).

6.4. Regarding claim 2, Manning appears to teach storing the persistent data in at least one of the storage format and the storage location during the runtime of the system (figure 3, item 124; and paragraph [0029]).

6.4.1. Regarding (figure 3, item 124; and paragraph [0029]), it was inherent that the actions described in figure 3 are performed during the runtime of the system.

6.5. Regarding claim 3, Manning appears to teach that the metadata comprises at least in part a description of the model structure (figure 3, item 102; please note that a DTD is a Document Type Definition that provides attributes for each element in the document, and indicates the relationship of the elements – please refer to paragraph [0004]).

6.6. Regarding claim 6, Manning appears to teach selecting a transform, based on the metadata, to establish at least one of the storage format and the storage location (figure 3, item 102; and paragraph [0028], sentences 1 - 4).

6.7. Regarding claim 7, Manning appears to teach retrieving persistent data from storage using a transform during the runtime of the system (figure 4, all items; and paragraph [0030]).

6.8. Regarding claim 8, Manning appears to teach receiving persistent data compatible with at least one of any type of processor, any type of programming language, any type of operating system, and any type of architecture (paragraph [0021]).

6.9. Regarding claim 9, Manning appears to teach a data storage device (paragraph [0021]).

6.10. Regarding claim 9, Manning appears to teach a persistence engine to receive a persistence package (figure 3, all items; and paragraph [0038]. Please note that the embodiment of the invention as an apparatus is inherently a persistence engine), wherein the persistence engine uses metadata passed from the persistence package to establish, during a runtime of the system, at least one of a storage format and a storage location to store the persistent data in the data storage device (figure 3, all items; and paragraph [0021]).

6.11. Regarding claim 10, Manning appears to teach the data storage device is external to a running system using the persistence engine (paragraph [0021]).

6.12. Regarding claim 11, Manning appears to teach a storing interface to store the persistent data using at least one of the storage format and storage location (paragraph [0027], second sentence).

6.13. Regarding claim 12, Manning appears to teach a retrieving interface to retrieve the persistent data for use by one of the running system and an application (paragraph [0027], second sentence; and paragraph [0030]).

6.13.1. Regarding paragraph [0027], second sentence; and paragraph [0030]; it was inherent that the received query is from one of a running system and an application.

6.14. Regarding claim 13, Manning appears to teach that the metadata comprises at least in part a description of the data model structure of the persistent data (figure 3, item 102; please note that a DTD is a Document Type Definition that provides attributes for each element in the document, and indicates the relationship of the elements - please refer to paragraph [0004]).

6.15. Regarding claim 15, Manning appears to teach that the persistence engine receives a persistence package comprising the metadata and the persistent data (figure 3, item 100 – 102; please note that a DTD is a Document Type Definition that provides attributes for each element in the document, and indicates the relationship of the elements - please refer to paragraph [0004]; and paragraph [0028]).

6.16. Regarding claim 16, Manning appears to teach that the persistence engine receives persistent data structured using any data model from a source

comprising at least one of any type of processor, any type of operating system, any type of programming language, and any type of architecture (figure 3; all items).

6.16.1. Regarding (figure 3; all items); it was inherent that any type of data model can be expressed in an XML document.

6.17. Regarding claim 17; Manning appears to teach a metadata engine having a metadata reader (paragraph [0027] – please note that it was inherent that the XML document manager includes a metadata reader) and a metadata filter (paragraph [0027] – please note that the XML parser was a metadata filter).

6.18. Regarding claim 18, Manning appears to teach that the metadata filter interprets the metadata (paragraph [0027]).

6.19. Regarding claim 19, Manning appears to teach a transform engine having a set of transforms, a transform selector, and a transform generator (figure 3, items 102 – 110; and paragraph [0028]).

6.20. Regarding claim 20, Manning appears to teach that a transform establishes at least one of the storage format and the storage location to store the persistent data in the data storage device (paragraphs [0028] and [0029]).

6.21. Regarding claim 22, Manning appears to teach that a transform selector selects a transform based on filtered metadata (figure 3, items 100 – 102; and paragraphs [0027] and [0028]).

6.22. Regarding claim 23, Manning appears to teach that a transform selector requests a transform from the transform generator based on filtered metadata (figure 3, items 100 – 110; and paragraphs [0027] and [0028]).

6.23. Regarding claim 23, Manning appears to teach that the transform generator produces a transform that remodels the persistent data to approximate as closely as possible a preexisting transform from the set of transforms (lines 14 – 16 of paragraph [0028]).

6.24. Regarding claim 43, Manning appears to teach a machine-readable medium comprising instructions that are executed by a machine (paragraphs [0021] and [0022]).

6.24.1. Regarding (paragraphs [0021] and [0022]); it was inherent that instructions cause a machine to execute because a computer was a machine, and computers inherently execute instructions.

6.25. Regarding claim 43, Manning appears to teach receiving persistent data having a model structure (figure 3, item 100 – 102; and paragraphs [0028] and [0029]; please note that a DTD is a Document Type Definition that provides attributes for each element in the document, and indicates the relationship of the elements – please refer to paragraph [0004]).

6.26. Regarding claim 43, Manning appears to teach receiving metadata comprising at least in part a description of the model structure (figure 3, items 100 – 102; and paragraph [0028]).

6.27. Regarding claim 43, Manning appears to teach to establish, using the metadata during a runtime of the system, at least one of a storage format and a

storage location for the persistent data (figure 3, items 100 – 110; and paragraph [0028]).

6.28. Regarding claim 44, Manning appears to teach instructions (paragraphs [0021] and [0022]), that when executed, cause a machine to store the persistent data using at least one of the storage format and the storage location (figure 3, item 124; and paragraph [0029]).

6.29. Regarding claim 47, Manning appears to teach instructions, that when executed cause a machine to retrieve the persistent data from at least one of the storage format and the storage location (figure 4, all items; and paragraph [0030]).

6.30. Regarding claim 48, Manning appears to teach instructions, that when executed, cause a machine to select and/or create, based on the metadata, a transform to establish at least one of the storage format and the storage location (figure 3, items 102 - 110; and paragraph [0028], sentences 1 - 4).

6.31. Regarding claim 49, Manning appears to teach receiving persistent data compatible with at one of any type of processor, any type of programming language, any type of operating system, and any type of architecture (paragraph [0021]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been

obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 4 – 5, 14, 45 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number US 2002/0103829) in view of XML (“Extensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0”; W3C Recommendation 10-Feb-98, 1998).

8.1. Claim 4 is a dependent claim of claim 1, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 1.

8.2. Claim 5 is a dependent claim of claim 4, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 4.

8.3. Claim 14 is a dependent claim of claim 13, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 13.

8.4. Claim 45 is a dependent claim of claim 43, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 43.

8.5. Claim 46 is a dependent claim of claim 45, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 45.

8.6. The art of Manning is directed toward a method, system, program, and data structures for managing structured XML documents in a database (Title and Abstract; and paragraph [0020] regarding the XML document).

8.7. The art of XML is directed toward describing the Extensible Markup Language (XML) (Abstract).

8.8. Regarding claim 5, Manning appears to teach extracting persistent data and metadata from a persistence package using a filter *paragraph [0027] – please note that it was inherent that a parser is used to extract persistent data and metadata from an XML document*.

8.9. Regarding claim 45, Manning appears to teach receiving metadata *figure 3, item 100; and paragraph [0004] – please note that an XML document contains both persistent data and metadata*.

8.10. Regarding claim 46, Manning appears to teach receiving a persistence package comprising persistent data and metadata *figure 3, item 100; and paragraph [0004] – please note that an XML document contains both persistent data and metadata*.

8.11. Regarding claim 4, Manning does not specifically teach that the metadata conforms to a metadata template comprising rules for describing the model structure.

8.12. Regarding claim 14, Manning does not specifically teach a metadata template to format the metadata for readable reception by the persistence engine.

8.13. Regarding claim 45, Manning does not specifically teach receiving metadata *conforming to a metadata template comprising rules for describing a data model structure of the persistent data*.

8.14. Regarding claim 4, XML appears to teach that the metadata conforms to a metadata template comprising rules for describing the model structure *page 2, section 2. Documents, first sentence; and page 3, section 2.1 Well-Formed XML Documents*.

8.14.1. Regarding *(page 2, section 2. Documents, first sentence; and page 3, section 2.1 Well-Formed XML Documents)*; the reference XML describes the rules that the metadata conforms to.

8.15. Regarding claim 14, XML appears to teach a metadata template to format the metadata for readable reception by the persistence engine *(page 2, section 2. Documents, first sentence; and page 3, section 2.1 Well-Formed XML Documents)*.

8.15.1. Regarding *(page 2, section 2. Documents, first sentence; and page 3, section 2.1 Well-Formed XML Documents)*; the reference XML describes the rules that the metadata conforms to, and specifically the production in section 2.1 is a metadata template.

8.16. Regarding claim 45, Manning appears to teach that the metadata received in claim 45 conforms to a metadata template comprising rules for describing a data model structure of the persistent data *(page 2, section 2. Documents, first sentence; and page 3, section 2.1 Well-Formed XML Documents)*.

8.16.1. Regarding *(page 2, section 2. Documents, first sentence; and page 3, section 2.1 Well-Formed XML Documents)*; the reference XML describes the rules that the metadata conforms to, and specifically the production in section 2.1 is a metadata template.

8.17. The art of XML and the art of Manning are analogous art because they both contain the art of interpreting XML documents.

8.18. The motivation to combine the art of XML with the art of Manning would have been obvious given the need in Manning to interpret XML documents, and the rules given in XML to form valid XML documents.

8.19. Regarding claim 5, Manning appears to teach extracting the persistent and the metadata data from the persistence package (figure 3, all items; and paragraphs [0028] and [0029]) using a filter (paragraph [0027] – please note that the XML parser is a filter).

8.20. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to produce the claimed inventions.

9. Claims 21 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number US 2002/0103829) in view of DeltaXML (web page for DeltaXML.com from September 2001 using [www.archive.org](http://www.archive.org/web/20011021144026/www.deltaxml.com/prod-xmlschema-1000.html) at [web.archive.org/web/20011021144026/www.deltaxml.com/prod-xmlschema-1000.html](http://www.archive.org/web/20011021144026/www.deltaxml.com/prod-xmlschema-1000.html)).

9.1. Claim 21 is a dependent claim of claim 19, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 19.

9.2. Claim 30 is a dependent claim of claim 29, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 29.

9.3. The art of Manning is directed toward a method, system, program, and data structures for managing structured XML documents in a database (Title and Abstract; and paragraph [0020] regarding the XML document).

9.4. The art of DeltaXML is directed toward comparing XML schema DTD files to determine differences (page 1, box labeled Description).

9.5. Regarding claim 21, Manning does not specifically teach that the transform selector comprises a data model comparator.

9.6. Regarding claim 30, Manning does not specifically teach a data model variance calculator.

9.7. DeltaXML teaches a data model comparator (page 1, box labeled Description), which also calculates the data model variance.

9.8. The art of DeltaXML and the art of Manning are analogous art because they both contain the problem of determining whether a pair of DTD's are different (Manning, lines 14 – 17 of paragraph [0028]).

9.9. The motivation to use the art of DeltaXML with the art of Manning would have been obvious given the need recited in Manning to determine whether documents have different DTD's (Manning, lines 14 – 17 of paragraph [0028]).

10. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number US 2002/0103829) in view of Kanne (Kanne, Carl-Christian; Moerkotte, Guido; “Efficient storage of XML data”, 1999, Technical Report 8/99, University of Mannheim).

10.1. Claim 25 is a dependent claim of claim 23, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 23.

10.2. The art of Manning is directed toward a method, system, program, and data structures for managing structured XML documents in a database (Title and Abstract; and paragraph [0020] regarding the XML document).

10.3. The art of Kanne is directed toward efficient storage of XML data (Title).

10.4. Manning does not specifically teach that the transform generator produces a transform that substantially maintains the model structure of the persistent data received by the running system.

10.5. Kanne appears to teach that the transform generator produces a transform that substantially maintains the model structure of the persistent data received by the running system (pages 4 – 5, section 2.2 Logical Model – please note the use of a tree structure for XML. XML was inherently tree structured.).

10.6. The art of Kanne and the art of Manning are analogous art because they are both directed to the storage of XML data.

10.7. The motivation to use the art of Kanne with the art of Manning would have been obvious given the benefit recited in Kanne of describing a method to dynamically maintain efficient physical storage for large tree structured objects (page 20, section 6 Conclusion and Future Work).

11. Claims 26 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number US 2002/0103829) in view of Schoning (Schoning, Harald; “Tamino – a DBMS Designed for XML”, 2001 Proceedings 17th International Conference on Data Engineering, 2-6 April 2001).

11.1. Claim 26 is a dependent claim of claim 23, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 23.

11.2. Claim 42 is a dependent claim of claim 36, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 36.

11.3. The art of Manning is directed toward a method, system, program, and data structures for managing structured XML documents in a database (**Title and Abstract; and paragraph [0020] regarding the XML document**).

11.4. The art of Schoning is directed toward a database management system designed for XML (**Title**).

11.5. Manning does not specifically teach that the transform generator produces a transform to remodel the persistent data to maximize efficient retrieval for an application.

11.6. Regarding claim 26, Schoning appears to teach that the transform generator produces a transform to remodel the persistent data to maximize efficient retrieval for an application (**page 152, section labeled “Indexing and storage methods”**).

11.6.1. Regarding (**page 152, section labeled “Indexing and storage methods”**); it would have been obvious to design the transform generator to produce a transform to remodel the persistent data to maximize efficient retrieval for an application.

11.7. Regarding claim 42, Schoning appears to teach that assembling a transform includes optimizing efficient indexing for the persistent data (**page 152, section labeled “Indexing and storage methods”**).

11.7.1. Regarding (**page 152, section labeled “Indexing and storage methods”**); it would have been obvious that assembling a transform includes optimizing efficient indexing for the persistent data.

11.8. The art of Manning and the art of Schoning are analogous art because they are both directed to the art of XML databases.

11.9. The motivation to use the art of Schoning with the art of Manning would have been obvious given the statement recited in Schoning that indexes are indispensable in database systems because otherwise large amounts of data could not be efficiently queried (page 152, section labeled “Indexing and storage methods”).

12. Claim 27, 32, 33, 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number US 2002/0103829) in view of Ives (Ives, Zachary G.; Florescu, Daniela; Friedman, Marc; Levy, Alon; Weld, Daniel S.; “An Adaptive Query Execution System for Data Integration”, 1999, SIGMOD 1999).

12.1. Claim 27 is a dependent claim of claim 23, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 23.

12.2. Claim 32 is a dependent claim of claim 29, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 29.

12.3. Claim 33 is a dependent claim of claim 32, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 32.

12.4. Claim 39 is a dependent claim of claim 36, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 36.

12.5. Claim 40 is a dependent claim of claim 36, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 36.

12.6. The art of Manning is directed toward a method, system, program, and data structures for managing structured XML documents in a database (**Title and Abstract; and paragraph [0020] regarding the XML document**).

12.7. The art of Ives is directed toward an adaptive query execution system for data integration (**Title**).

12.8. Regarding claim 27, Manning does not specifically teach that the transform generator uses iterative read-write trials to produce a transform to remodel the persistent data to maximize storage and/or retrieval speed.

12.9. Regarding claim 32, Manning does not specifically teach an efficient storage/retrieval speed maximizer.

12.10. Regarding claim 33, Manning does not specifically teach an efficient storage/retrieval speed maximizer comprising a read/write iterator.

12.11. Regarding claim 39, Manning does not specifically teach that assembling a transform includes maximizing data storage speed and/or data retrieval speed.

12.12. Regarding claim 40, Manning does not specifically teach that maximizing speed includes iteratively performing data read/write trials and selecting the fastest trial.

12.13. Regarding claim 27, Ives appears to teach that the transform generator uses iterative read-write trials to produce a transform to remodel the persistent data to maximize storage and/or retrieval speed (**page 304, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with “The query execution . . .”**).

12.13.1. Regarding (**page 304, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with “The query execution . . .”**); it would have been obvious to

design the transform generator to use iterative read-write trials to produce a transform to remodel the persistent data to maximize storage and/or retrieval speed.

12.14. Regarding claim 32, Ives appears to teach an efficient storage/retrieval speed maximizer (page 304, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with “The query execution . . . ”).

12.14.1. Regarding (page 304, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with “The query execution . . . ”); it would have been obvious to use an efficient storage/retrieval speed maximizer.

12.15. Regarding claim 33, Ives appears to teach an efficient storage/retrieval speed maximizer comprising a read/write iterator (page 304, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with “The query execution . . . ”).

12.15.1. Regarding (page 304, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with “The query execution . . . ”); it would have been obvious to use an efficient storage/retrieval speed maximizer comprising a read/write iterator.

12.16. Regarding claim 39, Ives appears to teach that assembling a transform includes maximizing data storage speed and/or data retrieval speed (page 304, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with “The query execution . . . ”).

12.16.1. Regarding (page 304, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with “The query execution . . . ”); it would have been obvious that assembling a transform includes maximizing data storage speed and/or data retrieval speed.

12.17. Regarding claim 40, Manning appears to teach that maximizing speed includes iteratively performing data read/write trials and selecting the fastest trial (page 304, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with "The query execution . . . ").

12.17.1. Regarding page 304, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with "The query execution . . . "; it would have been obvious that maximizing speed includes iteratively performing data read/write trials and selecting the fastest trial.

12.18. The art of Manning and the art of Ives are analogous art because they are both contain the problem of data queries (Manning, paragraph [0030]) and Ives (Title).

12.19. The motivation to use the art of Ives with the art of Manning would have been obvious given the statement recited in Ives that it is important to optimize the time to initial answers to a query (page 300, left-side column, the paragraph that starts with "Since data integration . . . ").

13. Claims 24, 28, 34 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number US 2002/0103829) in view of Deutsch (Deutsch, Alin; Fernandez, Mary; Suciu, Dan; "Storing Semistructured Data with STORED", 1999, Proceedings of the 1999 ACM SIGMOD international conference on management of data).

13.1. Claim 24 is a dependent claim of claim 23, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 23

13.2. Claim 28 is a dependent claim of claim 23, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 23.

13.3. Claim 34 is a dependent claim of claim 29, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 29.

13.4. Claim 41 is a dependent claim of claim 36, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 36.

13.5. The art of Manning is directed toward a method, system, program, and data structures for managing structured XML documents in a database (**Title and Abstract; and paragraph [0020] regarding the XML document**).

13.6. The art of Deutsch is directed toward a database for semistructured data, including XML (**Abstract**).

13.7. Regarding claim 24, Manning does not specifically teach that the transform generator produces a transform that remodels the persistent data to approximate as closely as possible a preexisting transform from the set of transforms.

13.8. Regarding claim 28, Manning does not specifically teach that the transform generator produces a transform to remodel the persistent data to maximize data compression.

13.9. Regarding claim 34, Manning does not specifically teach a data compression maximizer.

13.10. Regarding claim 41, Manning does not specifically teach that assembling a transform includes maximizing data compression.

13.11. Regarding claim 24, Manning appears to teach that the transform generator produces a transform that remodels the persistent data to approximate as closely as possible a preexisting transform from the set of transforms (**first**

page, right-side column, fourth paragraph that starts with “In the first application . . .”; second page, left-side column, second paragraph, and third paragraph, and fourth paragraph, bullet points).

13.12. Regarding claim 28, Deutsch appears to teach that the transform generator produces a transform to remodel the persistent data to maximize data compression (first page, right-side column, fourth paragraph that starts with “In the first application . . .”; second page, left-side column, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with, “The meaning of “good” depends on the application, but usually includes minimizing disk space . . .; and second page, left-side column, second paragraph and third paragraph and fourth paragraph).

13.12.1. Regarding (first page, right-side column, fourth paragraph that starts with “In the first application . . .”; second page, left-side column, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with, “The meaning of “good” depends on the application, but usually includes minimizing disk space . . .; and second page, left-side column, second paragraph and third paragraph and fourth paragraph); it would have been obvious to design the transform generator to produce a transform to remodel the persistent data to maximize data compression.

13.13. Regarding claim 34, Deutsch appears to teach a data compression maximizer (second page, left-side column, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with, “The meaning of “good” depends on the application, but usually includes minimizing disk space . . .”).

13.13.1. Regarding (second page, left-side column, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with, “The meaning of “good” depends on

the application, but usually includes minimizing disk space . . . “}; it
would have been obvious to use a data compression maximizer.

13.14. Regarding claim 41, Deutsch appears to teach that assembling a transform includes maximizing data compression (second page, left-side column, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with, “The meaning of “good” depends on the application, but usually includes minimizing disk space . . . “).

13.14.1. Regarding (second page, left-side column, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with, “The meaning of “good” depends on the application, but usually includes minimizing disk space . . . “}; it
would have been obvious that assembling a transform includes maximizing data compression.

13.15. The art of Manning and the art of Deutsch are analogous art because they both contain the problem storing XML data in a database.

13.16. The motivation to use the art of Deutsch with the art of Manning would have been obvious given the requirement recited in Deutsch of the need to generate a good relational schema (first page, right-side column, last sentence, continuing on the second page).

14. Claims 29 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number US 2002/0103829) in view of Deutsch (Deutsch, Alin; Fernandez, Mary; Suciu, Dan; “Storing Semistructured Data with STORED”, 1999, Proceedings of the 1999 ACM SIGMOD international conference on management of data).

14.1. The art of Manning is directed toward a method, system, program, and data structures for managing structured XML documents in a database (Title and Abstract; and paragraph [0020] regarding the XML document).

14.2. The art of Deutsch is directed toward a database for semistructured data, including XML (Abstract).

14.3. Regarding claim 29, Manning appears to teach a data model description receiver (figure 3, items 100 - 102).

14.3.1. Regarding (figure 3, items 100 - 102); it would have been obvious that in order to receive an XML document that contains a DTD (i.e. data model description), that there was a data model description receiver.

14.4. Regarding claim 29, Manning appears to teach a set of transforms (figure 3, items 102 - 110).

14.4.1. Regarding (figure 3, items 100 - 110); it would have been obvious that there was a set of transforms since storage locations are determined.

14.5. Regarding claim 36, Manning appears to teach receiving a data model description (figure 3, items 100 - 102).

14.5.1. Regarding (figure 3, items 100 - 102); it would have been obvious that a data model description is received.

14.6. Regarding claim 36, Manning appears to teach comparing the data model description to a preexisting data model (figure 3, items 100 - 102; and paragraph [0028]).

14.6.1. Regarding figure 3, items 100 – 102; and paragraph [0028]:

it would have been obvious that to compare the data model description to a preexisting data model since it is determined whether there are tables for the received DTD.

14.7. Regarding claim 29, Manning does not specifically teach a data model comparator to produce a comparison between the data model description and a data model in a transform in the set of transforms.

14.8. Regarding claim 29, Manning does not specifically teach an assembler to produce a transform based on the data model description and/or the comparison.

14.9. Regarding claim 29, Deutsch appears to teach a data model comparator to produce a comparison between the data model description and a data model in a transform in the set of transforms (first page, right-side column, fourth paragraph that starts with “In the first application . . .”; second page, left-side column, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with, “The meaning of “good” depends on the application, but usually includes minimizing disk space . . . “; and second page, left-side column, second paragraph and third paragraph and fourth paragraph).

14.9.1. Regarding first page, right-side column, fourth paragraph that starts with “In the first application . . .”; second page, left-side column, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with, “The meaning of “good” depends on the application, but usually includes minimizing disk space . . . “; and second page, left-side column, second paragraph and third paragraph and fourth paragraph, it would have been obvious that there was a data model comparator to

produce a comparison between the data model description and a data model in a transform in the set of transforms.

14.10. Regarding claim 29, Deutsch appears to teach an assembler to produce a transform based on the data model description and/or the comparison (first page, right-side column, fourth paragraph that starts with “In the first application . . .”; second page, left-side column, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with, “The meaning of “good” depends on the application, but usually includes minimizing disk space . . . “; and second page, left-side column, second paragraph and third paragraph and fourth paragraph).

14.10.1. Regarding (first page, right-side column, fourth paragraph that starts with “In the first application . . .”; second page, left-side column, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with, “The meaning of “good” depends on the application, but usually includes minimizing disk space . . . “; and second page, left-side column, second paragraph and third paragraph and fourth paragraph); it would have been obvious that there was an assembler to produce a transform based on the data model description and/or the comparison.

14.11. Regarding claim 36, Deutsch appears to teach assembling a transform based on the data model description and/or the comparison to establish a storage format and/or a storage location for persistent data during runtime of the system model (first page, right-side column, fourth paragraph that starts with “In the first application . . .”; second page, left-side column, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with, “The meaning of “good” depends on the application, but usually includes minimizing disk space .

... “; and second page, left-side column, second paragraph and third paragraph and fourth paragraph).

14.11.1. Regarding (first page, right-side column, fourth paragraph that starts with “In the first application . . .”; second page, left-side column, first paragraph, the sentence that starts with, “The meaning of “good” depends on the application, but usually includes minimizing disk space . . . “; and second page, left-side column, second paragraph and third paragraph and fourth paragraph); it would have been obvious to assemble a transform based on the data model description and/or the comparison to establish a storage format and/or a storage location for persistent data during runtime of the system model.

14.12. The art of Manning and the art of Deutsch are analogous art because they both contain the problem storing XML data in a database.

14.13. The motivation to use the art of Deutsch with the art of Manning would have been obvious given the requirement recited in Deutsch of the need to generate a good relational schema (first page, right-side column, last sentence, continuing on the second page).

14.14. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Deutsch with the art of Manning to produce the claimed invention.

15. Claims 31, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number US 2002/0103829) in view of Nestorov (Nestorov, Svetlozar; Abiteboul, Serge; Motwani, Rajeev; “Extracting

Schema from Semistructured Data", 1998, Proceedings of the 1998 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data).

15.1. Claim 31 is a dependent claim of claim 29, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 29.

15.2. Claim 37 is a dependent claim of claim 36, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 36.

15.3. Claim 38 is a dependent claim of claim 36, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 36.

15.4. The art of Manning is directed toward a method, system, program, and data structures for managing structured XML documents in a database (Title and Abstract; and paragraph [0020] regarding the XML document).

15.5. The art of Nestorov is directed toward extracting a schema (i.e. data model) from semistructured data (e.g. XML data) (Title and Abstract).

15.6. Regarding claim 31, Manning does not specifically teach a data model approximator.

15.7. Regarding claim 37, Manning does not specifically teach that assembling a transform includes measuring a variance between the data model description and a preexisting data model.

15.8. Regarding claim 38, Manning does not specifically teach that assembling a transform includes approximating a preexisting data model.

15.9. Regarding claim 31, Nestorov teaches a data model approximator (page 1, Abstract; and page 6, section 3 Metod Summary, first sentence).

15.10. Regarding claim 37, Nestorov teaches that assembling a transform includes measuring a variance between the data model description and a preexisting data model (page 8 - 10, section 5.2 Distance function between types).

15.10.1. Regarding (page 8 - 10, section 5.2 Distance function between types); it would have been obvious that assembling a transform includes measuring a variance between the data model description and a preexisting data model.

15.11. Regarding claim 38, Nestorov teaches that assembling a transform includes approximating a preexisting data model (page 1, Abstract; and page 6, section 3 Method Summary, first sentence).

15.11.1. Regarding (page 1, Abstract; and page 6, section 3 Method Summary, first sentence); it would have been obvious that assembling a transform includes approximating a preexisting data model.

15.12. The art of Nestorov and the art of Manning are analogous art because they both contain the problem of determining the data model of semistructured data.

15.13. The motivation to use the art of Nestorov with the art of Manning would have been obvious given the benefit recited in Nestorov of determining the data model for semistructured data where the data model is implicit is the data (Abstract).

16. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number US 2002/0103829) in view of Mani (U.S. Patent 6,654,734 B1).

16.1. Claim 35 is a dependent claim of claim 29, and thereby inherits all of the rejected limitations of claim 29.

16.2. The art of Manning is directed toward a method, system, program, and data structures for managing structured XML documents in a database (**Title and Abstract; and paragraph [0020] regarding the XML document**).

16.3. The art of Mani is directed toward a method for query optimization for XML document databases (**Title and Abstract**).

16.4. Manning does not specifically teach an indexing estimator.

16.5. Mani appears to teach an indexing estimator (**column 11, lines 54 –57, the referenced index access cost estimator**).

16.5.1. Regarding (**column 11, lines 54 –57, the referenced index access cost estimator**), it would have been obvious to use an indexing estimator.

16.6. The art of Mani and the art of Manning are analogous art because they both contain the problem of queries for an XML database (**Mani, Title**) and (**Manning, paragraph [0030]**).

16.7. The motivation to use the art of Mani with the art of Manning would have been obvious given the benefit recited in Mani of query optimization (**Title and Abstract**).

Conclusion


17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Russell L. Guill whose telephone number is 571-

272-7955. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday 9:00 AM – 5:30 PM.

18. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Teska can be reached on 571-272-3716. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100 Group Receptionist: 571-272-2100.

19. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RG



KEVIN J. TESKA
SUPERVISORY
PATENT EXAMINER